गुजरात में गरीब लोगों की पहचान करने के लिए मानदंड

2596. **श्री अनन्तराय देवशंकर दवे :** क्या **प्रधान मंत्री** यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या देश में गरीब लोगों की संख्या का अनुमान लगाने के लिए गठित विशेष दल ने ऐसे लोगों की पहचान करने हेतु किसी दिशा निर्देश अथवा मानदंड का सुझाव दिया है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो तत्संबंधी ब्यौरा क्या है ;

(ग) क्या वर्ष 1991 तक गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रहने वाले लोगों की संख्या के संबध में कोई मूल्यांकन किया गया है ;

(घ) यदि हां, तो तत्संबंधी जिला-वार ब्यौरा क्या है ; और

(ङ) राज्य के कच्छ, पंचमहल, सुरेन्द्र नगर और बनासकान्ठा जिलों में गरीब व्यक्तियों का ब्यौरा क्या है ?

योजना और कार्यक्रम कार्यान्वयन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्रीमती रत नमाला देहरेश्वर सवनूर) : (क) योजना आयोग को गुजरात में गरीब लोगों का अनुमान लगाने के लिए किसी विशेष दल के गठन की जानकारी नहीं है ;

(ख) उपर्युक्त (क) को ध्यान में रखते हुए प्रश्न नहीं उठता ।

(ग) योजना आयोग उपभोक्ता व्यय पर पंचवार्षिक राष्ट्रीय नमूना सवर्क्षण (एनएसएस) आंकड़ों के आधार पर गरीबी का अनुमान लगाता है । नवीनतम अनुमान 1993-94 वर्ष से संबंधित है जो एनएसएस उपभोक्ता व्यय आंकड़ों के 50वें दौर पर आधारित है । इसके अनुसार गुजरात में गरीबी रेखा से नीचे जीवनयापन करने वाले व्यक्ति 1993-94 में ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में 22.18 प्रतिशत शहरी क्षेत्रों में 27.89 प्रतिशत और पूरे राज्य के लिए 24.21 प्रतिशत होने का अनुमान लगाया गया है। पूर्व अनुमान 1987-88 से संबंधित है, जिसमें गुजरात में गरीबी रेखा से नीचे जीवन-यापन करने वाले व्यक्तियों की संख्या ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में 28.67 प्रतिशत, शहरी राज्यों में 37.26 प्रतिशत और पूरे राज्य के लिए 31.54 प्रतिशत होने का अनुमान लगाया गया है ।

(घ) और (ङ) गरीबी के अनुमान राज्य स्तर पर लगाए जाते हैं न कि जिला स्तर पर ।

Changes in the Gadgil-Mukherjee formula

2597. SHRI BHAGABAN MAJHI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) the salient features of the Gadgil-Mukherjee formula adopted by the Planning Commission;

(b) whether several State Governments have demanded changes in the formula;

(c) if so, the reaction of Government thereto;

(d) whether Government propose to focus on prority sector; and

(e) if so, the steps taken in implementing the plan drawn-up in that regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRIMATI RATNAMALA DEHARESHWAR SAVANOOR): (a) Gadgil Mukherjee Formula as approved by National Development Council (NDC) in 1991 is the basis for allocating Normal Central Assistance to States Plan This formula was adopted for distribution of Normal Central Assistance during the Eighth Five Year Plan and Annual Plan 1997-98 As per this Formula, after setting apart funds required for Externally Aided Projects and

reasonable amounts of funds for Special Area Programmes, 30 percent of the balance is earmarked for 10 Special Category States. The balance amount is distributed among non-Special Category States on the basis of specific criteria and weights. The background note on Gadgil-Mukherjee Formula is appended at Statement (*See* below).

(b) and (c) In the National Development Council (NDC) meeting held on 16.1.97 as well as during the meetings between Deputy Chairman and Chief Ministers at the time of finalisation of Annual Plan 1997-98, some Chief Ministers have suggested further revision in the Formula. A revision in the Formula requires approval of NDC. In order to enable the Planning Commission to take a holistic view on the matter, all the Chief Ministers have been requested by the Planning Commisssion to send their considered views/comments on this issue. The Commission is in the midst of receiving comments from the States. On receipt of all these comments the matter would be put up to National Development Council for consideration.

(d) and (e) Yes Sir. The approach paper to the Ninth Plan (1997—2002) approved by the NDC in its meeting held on 16-01-1997 focusses on priority sictor. The formulation of Ninth Five Year Plan on the basis of approach paper is presently underway in Planning Commission.

STATEMENT

Planning Commission
(Financial Resources Division)

A Background Note on Gadgil Formula for distribution of Central Assistance for State Plans

Prior to Fourth Five Year Plan, the allocation of Central Assistance to the State Plans was based on a schematic pattern and there was no definite formula for allocation. In view of the general demand for an objective and transparent formula for allocation of Central assistance for State plans, a formula known as Gadgil fomula was evolved in 1969 which was adopted for distribution of plan assistance during the Fourth and Fifth Five Year plans. This formula was modified in 1980 and the modified formula became the basis for allocation during the Sixth and Seventh Five Year Plans. The modified formula was again revised in 1990 and formed the basis for allocation of Central assistance for 1991-92 only. Following representations, the formula was further revised in 1991. The Gadgil Formula (1991), has been in operation during the Eighth Plan period. Only the details of 1991 formula are discussed below, as others are only of historical value. However for comparision purposes all the 4 formulae with criterion and weight in respect of distribution among Non-Special Category States are given at the end of the Statement.

Gadgil Formula (1991)

The formula is known as *Gadgil-Mukherjee Formula*. The main features of the formula are the following:

I. From the total Central assistance, set apart funds required for externally aided schemes.

II. From the balance, provide reasonable amounts for Special Area Programmes viz.

(a) Hill Areas;

(b) Tribal Areas;

(c) Border Areas;

(d) N E C.

(e) Other Programmes

III. From the balance, give 30 per cent to the Special Category States.

IV. Distribute the balance among the non-Special Category States as per following criteria and weights.

Criteria	Weight (%)
1. Population (1971)	60
2. Per Capta Income	25
(a) 'Deviation' method-covering States with per capita SDP below the national average	20
(b) Distance method-covering all States	5
3. Performance	7.5
(a) Tax effort	
(b) Fiscal Management and	
(c) Progress in respect of national objectives	
4. Special problems	7.5

Under the criterion of the progress in respect of national objectives, the approved formula covers four objectives viz; (i) population control and maternal and child health; (ii) Universalisation of primary education and adult education; (iii) on-time completion of extrnally aided projects; and (iv) success in land reforms. Weights have been assigned separately for each of these within the overall weight of 7.5 percent as under:—

Items	Weights
(a) Tax policy	2.5%
(b) Fiscal management	2.0%
(c) National Objective	3.0%
(i) Population control	1.0%
(ii) Elimination of illiteracy	1.0%
(iii) On-time completion of Externally aided projects	0.5%
(iv) Land reforms	.5%

In respect of Special problems, there was no specific criteria, and it was left to the Planning Commission to use its discretion in the allotment.

Details in regard to Working out individual share of States in regard to population, income criteria and performance are as under.

Special Category States

There is no objective criteria and weight for distribution among the special category States The main considerations were the level of allotment in the previous years, resource position of States and also development needs etc.

Non-Special Category States

1. Population riterion

60 percent weight is given to population. The population as per 1971 Census is taken into consideration. 1971 population has been adopted on the basis of a Statement of Policy issued in June 1977. Each of the 15 States is given Central assistance in proportion to the share of its population to total population.

2. Income criteria

25 percent weight has been assigned to this. This has two components namely 20 percent on the basis of Deviation criterion, and 5 percent on Distance criterion.

(a) Deviation criterion—weight 20%

The States are identified on the basis of per capita comparable State domestic Product compared to the corresponding national average. The States which are below national average are identified and 20 percent of the assistance is exclusively allotted to them. 1 percent band is also permitted so that a State with per capita SDP higher than the national average but within one percent variation (upper side) from the national average is also given the benefit of being within the group of States below national average. For the purpose of calculating the per capita SDP, an average of per capita SDP for the latest three years for which actuals are available is taken into consideration. The C S O has been entrusted with the task of providing comparable per capita SDP of the States. For 1996-97 the relevant years are 1990-91, 91-92 and 92-93 Once the States are identified their relative weights are determined on the basis of distance of per capita income of State from the per capita income of the State which has the highest per capita income. For calculation purpose, Income of Punjab has been adopted for 1996-97 Though Goa has higher income, it was not taken because of its small size and substantial difference from other States. These values were multiplied with 1971 population of each state. The product so derived of each State is divided by the total product and multiplied by the population.

(b) Distance Method Weight 5 per cent.

In this case the comparable per capita State Domestic Product prepared by C.S.O. as in the case of Deviation Method is used. The distance of per capita income of each State from per capita income of that State which has the highest per capita income, is measured. These values were multiplied with the population of each state. The percentage share of each States is obtained by dividing the product so arrived at by the total products and multiplied by 100. Punjab and Goa have been assigned in 1996-97 a weight equal to the weight of that State, which has the next height per capita income.

An important point to be noted is that in both Deviation and Distance method, the distance from the highest per capita income, to the per capita income of each State is measures to arrive at the share of each State. In the case of deviation method, deviation from the National average has been used to identify the States eligible for allocation of assistance of 20 percent

Performance

1 Tax Effort

The basis of the criterion is the tax—SDP ratio of a State. The ratios are calculated based on the annual average tax receipts and comparable SDP of the State for the latest 3 consecutive years. After computing the tax/SDP ratio, the share of each State is arrived at by converting the total of these percentages to 100. For 1996-97 data relating to 1990—93 were used.

2 Fiscal Management

The criterion is based on the difference between State's Own Resources (comprising of BCR, ARM, contribution of public enterprises, small savings excluding UTI loans. Provident Funds, Miscellaneous Capital Receipts (Net), adjustment of opening/closing balance) as provided in the financing pattern approved for the State plan outlays and the actuals. A time period of 5 years (latest available) is taken into consideration. More precisely, the steps involved in the calculation for determining the share of each State are:

(i) the difference between the State's own resources as per the Annual Plan estimate and the actual is calculated as percentage of the Annual Plan estimate of State's own resources, (ii) the distance of each state from the lowest performance is calculated and (iii) the share of each State is derived as percentage of the total distances. The lowest State is also given a weight equivalent to the State which is nearest to it. Data relating to 1989-94 were used for determining the share in 1996-97.

Population Control

The criterion to be adopted is the difference between the desired performance and actual performance in relation to birth rate and infant mortality rate (IMR). The desired performance rate is calculated as the difference between the goal to be achieved by 2000 AD and the actual rate of the base year divided by the remaining number of years. In this method, the difference between the desired performance rate and the actual is worked out for each State and the distance of each State from the lowest performing State is calculated. The lowest performing State is given a value equal to the next lowest State. The States which have accomplished the goal are given the value equal to the next best performing State. These values are converted into percentages to the total to determine the share of each State in the distribution. The methodology of calculation is the same for birth rate and IMR. Since both the considerations are given equal weight, the average of the two shares is calculated for each state and this determines its share in the total distribution. For the year 1996-97 data relating to 1993 and 1994 were used.

4. Elimination of Illiteracy

The indicator in this case is the performance relating to female literacy. We have chosen female literacy, as this focuses on an important segment of the population which needs special attention. The factors taken into consideration are the female literacy rate in 1991 and the decennial growth rate of female literacy taken into consideration are the female literacy rate, the share of each State is determined as a proportion of each State's performance to the total of all States. A similar method is followed with respect to decennial growth rate of female literacy. Since both the considerations are given equal weight, an average of the two shares is calculated for each State and this determines its share in the total distribution. For determining the share for 1996-97, the female literacy rate 1991 and Decennial growth 1981—1991 were used.

5. On-Time Completion of Externally Aided Projects

This criterion takes into account available finance in the year for externally aided projects as indicated by the Ministry of Finance in the Revised Estimates and the actual utilisation. In this method, the utilisation of external aid as a percentage of available finance for each State as indicated in the Revised Estimates for the latest year for which information is available is calculated. These ratios are converted as percentages to the total which give the shares of individual

States. For the year 1996-97 RE figures of Ministry of Finance for 1995-96 were used.

6. Land Reforms

The criterion for land reforms takes into account two indicators, namely area distributed as a percentage of surplus land declared by the State and area distributed by a State as a percentage of total area distributed by all States. Both are assigned equal weights. The share of each State under each indicator is Determined on the basis of each State's percentage to the total of all States. Since both the considerations are given equal weight, the average of the two shares is calculated for each State and this determines its share in the total distribution. For 1996-97 date of 1992 were used.

Criteria and weightage under Original Gadgil formula, Modified gadgil formula and formulae revised in October, 1990 and in December, 1991 for allocation of Central Assistance for State Plan

(Weightage %)

Criteria	Original Gadgil Formula (1969)	Modified Gadgil Formula (1980)	NDC Revised Formula (1990)	NDC Revised Formula (1991)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
A. Special Category States (10)	30% share of 3 States excluding N.E.C.	30% share of 8 States excluding N.E.C.	30% share of 10 States including N.E.C.	30% share of 10 States excluding NEC
B. Non-Special Category States (15)				
(i) Population (1971)	60.0	60.0	55.00	60.00
(ii) On-going major irrigation and power projects	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(iii) Per Capita Income of which	10.0	20.0	25.0	25.0
(a) According to the deviation method covering only the States with per capita income below the national average	10.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
(b) According to the distance method covering all the fifteen States	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0
(iv) Performance of which	10.0	10.0	5.0	5.0
(a) Tax effort	10.0	10.0	0.0	2.5
(b) Fiscal Management	0.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
(c) National Objectives	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1 Population Control	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
2 Elimination of Female illiteracy	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
3 On-time completion of externally aided projects	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
4 Success in Land Reforms	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
(v) Special Problems	10.0	10.0	15.0	7.5
TOTAL	10.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note Prior to Fourth Five Year Plan (1969-74) allocations varied from scheme to scheme. There was no formula as such for allocation of Central assistance for States' Plan. Thus, schematic pattern was in vogue.

मध्य प्रदेश में स्वीकृत परियोजनाएं

2598. **श्री गोविन्दराम मिरी** : क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) वर्ष 1995-96 के दौरान सरकार द्वारा कितनी परियोजनाएं स्वीकृत की गई तथा उनके लिए कितनी धनराशि स्वीकृत की गई ;

(ख) वर्ष 1996-97 तथा 1997-98 के दौरान मध्य प्रदेश की कौन-कौन सी परियोजनाओं को स्वीकृत करने हेतु केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा विचार किया गया है अथवा किया जा रहा है ;

(ग) क्या सरकार परियोजनाओं हेतु आदिवासी भूमि का हस्तांतरण केन्द्रीय सरकार के नाम से करने संबंधी समस्या के निराकरण हेतु विचार कर रही है ;

(घ) क्या मध्य प्रदेश सरकार ने बाघ एवं शेरों में ध्वनि एवं प्रकाश व्यवस्था हेतु 65 लाख रुपए का प्रस्ताव भेजा था ; और

(ङ) क्या सरकार उसे वर्ष 1997-98 में स्वीकृत करने का विचार रखती है ?

योजना और कार्यक्रम कार्यान्वयन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्रीमती र नमाला [illegible] मंत्री) : (क) और (ख) मंत्रालय की दृष्टि में योजना आयोग द्वारा प्रदेश के छिन्दवाड़ा जिले में "बांस के पौधे लगाने और पुनर्वास" पर एक परियोजना प्रस्ताव की 1995-96 में स्वीकृति दी गई थी इस परियोजना की लागत 23.913 मिलियन रु० थी और इसका वित्त पोषण इण्डो-कनाडियन एनवाइरनमेंट फैसिलटी द्वारा किया जाना था।

दिनांक 4-2-1997 को जल संसाधन मंत्रालय की तकनीकी सलाहकार समिति की सिफारिश के अंतर्गत अपर बेड़ा मझली सिंचाई परियोजना को योजना आयोग में प्राप्त किया गया था । राज्य सरकार द्वारा कुछ शर्तों का अनुपालन करने के बाद यह निदेश स्वीकृति के लिए इस परियोजना पर विचार करेगा ।

(ग) जी नहीं ।

(घ) और (ङ) पर्यटन विभाग ने 1997-98 के दौरान 66 लाख रुपए की केन्द्रीय वित्तीय सहायता के लिए ओरछा में सोन्द इट लुमीरी (एसईएल) प्रदर्शन को प्राथमिकता के रूप में रखा गया है। इस परियोजना की स्वीकृति राज्य सरकार से मार्ग निर्देशिकाओं के अनुरूप विस्तृत प्रस्ताव प्राप्त होने पर निर्भर करेगी ।

Maharashtra Government's schemes for inclusion in the Ninth Five Year Plan

2599. MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Maharashtra Government has forwarded any projects